



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

and character of his researches in the field of Roman architecture were well known to his friends, and it is no betrayal of confidence for me to state that the manuscript of his great work on Roman architecture from Vitruvius to the close of the empire, the appearance of which in his opinion was to mark the culmination of his more than half a century of study, was practically completed before his death. He lived, moreover, to see the triumph of Italian aims and the liberation of many a historic town and many a noble edifice which he knew and loved. Until ten days before his end he worked with unabated vigor; then the insidious malady which has brought deeper gloom to many homes just as the shadows of war time were departing claimed him as its victim.

None of us who knew him will soon forget his fine enthusiasm of voice, glance, and gesture, nor the vast funds of historical and archaeological information so unfailingly at his command. His death comes as a heavy blow to the scholarly community in Rome, and will be felt with especial poignancy by his American colleagues, who revered him as a master, loved him as a friend, and were never sent away empty-handed when they had turned to him for help. Every sentence in his comparatively small amount of literary output had been subjected by him to a process comparable to that through which the purest gold has been refined. The world may accept or reject his conclusions—few there are possessing the competence to pass judgment upon them: but there can be no difference of opinion as to his whole-hearted devotion to his work, and his unstinting employment of the remarkable gifts of eye and mind with which he was endowed. High were his ideals of life and work, precious the memory and inspiring the example which he leaves behind.

A. W. VAN BUREN

ROME
March 5, 1919

KIRBY FLOWER SMITH. 1862-1918

Humanistic studies in America have suffered no greater loss during the academic year now closing than that caused by the death of Professor Kirby Smith of Johns Hopkins University. I say "humanistic" studies because he was more than a professor

of Latin and Greek. His range included many languages and literatures, in which he read widely and from which he absorbed to an amazing degree not merely facts of language and literature, but the spirit of the culture from which they sprang and the essence of the life of which they were the expression. He actually was what classical scholars are so often supposed to be but in fact so rarely are. He was a humanist in the best sense of the word. He was not one of those who in public rave about the beauties of classical literature, but in their own studies and in classroom work confine themselves strictly to the discussion of disputed readings or of doubtful forms. No one ever had more respect for close philological work than he; no one could be more thorough, more critical than he in the preliminary study of a problem; but through the maze of philological minutiae he kept his bearings and he never lost sight of the *summum bonum* of classical studies, the life and literature of Greece and Rome. Like Professor Gildersleeve, who had a profound influence upon his development, he was both philologist and litterateur. With erudition he combined a fine literary appreciation; with technical skill, a curious subtlety of interpretation; and with the scholar's interest in a problem for its own sake, a human sympathy as wide as the world.

I first met him when I was a graduate student at Johns Hopkins many years ago. He was then collegiate professor of Latin, but he gave some courses in the graduate school. He lectured to us on the elegiac poets. To me who had just begun graduate work, the detailed character of his treatment, the elaborate care with which he discussed the text, the length of time he devoted to the question of the transposition of lines, the extent of the bibliography and all the other paraphernalia of technical scholarship were in the highest degree alarming. Not thus were Roman poets treated in the light and airy atmosphere of the undergraduate classroom from which I had so recently emerged. I had expected graduate work to be different from that which I had done in college, but I had never dreamed that an elegiac poet could be made the vehicle for such a burden of learning as this. But after a few weeks I realized how wrong my first impression had been.

He was merely clearing the way for his interpretation of the poets, and was following the method—unexcelled in thoroughness—of the Hopkins school. As soon as he had disposed of these preliminaries and had satisfactorily established a sound basis for literary discussion, he gave us an interpretation of Propertius and Tibullus that for vivid portrayal, critical acumen, and sympathetic appreciation was as charming as it was effective. Many years later I heard him lecture on Propertius at a meeting of the Classical Association of the Middle West and South. Some of the readers of this *Journal* heard him on that occasion and will recall the qualities of his literary style. He showed us Propertius as he was, with all his foibles, his genius, his brilliancy, and his egotism; and then with the art of the accomplished essayist he set him against the background of the Roman society of the time of Augustus, itself sketched in with consummate appreciation of light and shade. And not long ago, on a less formal occasion, I heard him read a paper on Tibullus at a meeting of a literary club in Baltimore, when he gave a number of translations of that poet's elegies, admirably done. Very few of those present were classical men. They were professors from various departments of the university and professional or business men of Baltimore, but I am inclined to think that they carried away with them a more vivid and lasting impression of Tibullus' art than most of the students to whom we professors of the classics deliver our lectures.

He loved old books and new, he loved a good story, and he loved his friends. Of the latter the number was legion. His buoyancy of temperament, his unfailing good humor, his keen sense of the ridiculous, his catholic human interests, gave his personality a unique attractiveness. Wherever he went he made friends, not only for himself, but also for classical studies. When I was at Hopkins he was the most popular instructor in the university, and I have no doubt that he remained so to the end. Nor is it likely that any of his students will ever doubt the value of the classics. He made them feel, as he himself sincerely felt, that only through Latin could one attain to a real appreciation of the literature of the world and see its successive stages in true perspective.

G. J. LAING